

### **REMARKS**

Claims 45, 49, 50, 51 and 56-58 are amended. Claims 14-21, 31-38, 48 and 52-53 are canceled. Claims 45-47, 49-51 and 54-61 are pending in the application.

Independent claims 14 and 31, and their dependent claims 15-21 and 32-38, respectively, stand rejected as being unpatentable over Srivastava (US Patent No. 6,225,745), or over a combination of Srivastava and Onda (US Patent No. 5,395,482). Without admission as to the propriety of the rejections, claims 14-21 and 31-38 are canceled.

Claims 45-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over a combination of Srivastava and Onda. The Examiner is reminded by direction to MPEP § 2143 that a proper obviousness rejection has the following three requirements: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings; 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) the combined references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Pending claims 45-51 and 54-61 are allowable over Srivastava and Onda for at least the reason that the references, individually or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest each and every element in any of those claims.

As amended, independent claim 45 recites a manifold assembly comprising a plenum chamber having plurality of precursor inlets received along the longitudinal axis with respective precursor feed streams on the body feeding to the plenum chamber precursor inlets. Claim 45 further recites respective multi-inlet valves positioned proximate the body in the respective precursor feed streams and a structure on the body configured to mount the body to a substrate processing chamber with the plenum chamber outlet proximate to and connected with a substrate processing chamber inlet, the respective multi-inlet valves when the body is so mounted all being totally received within peripheral

lateral confines of said chamber housing of the substrate processing chamber. The amendment to claim 45 incorporates the subject matter of claims 52 and 53 which are appropriately canceled. The amendment is further supported by the specification at, for example, Fig. 3 and the accompanying text. As acknowledged by the Examiner at page 13 §§ viii-ix of the January 9, 2006 Office Action, Srivastava does not disclose or suggest the recited multi-inlet valves being totally received within peripheral lateral confines of said chamber housing of the substrate processing chamber.

Onda is indicated as being relied upon as disclosing a multi-inlet valve (V49) totally received within the peripheral lateral confines of a chamber housing (Fig. 3); (see January 9, 2006 Action at page 18, § xxiii). However, claim 45 recites respective multi-inlet valves corresponding to a plurality of precursor inlets received along the longitudinal axis. Onda's valve V49 is but a single valve. Onda does not teach or suggest additional valves all totally received within the peripheral lateral confines of a chamber housing as recited in claim 45. As combined Srivastava and Onda fail to disclose or suggest the claim 45 recited manifold assembly comprising a plenum chamber having plurality of precursor inlets received along the longitudinal axis with respective precursor feed streams on the body feeding to the plenum chamber precursor inlets and having respective multi-inlet valves positioned proximate the body in the respective precursor feed streams, the respective multi-inlet valves all being totally received within peripheral lateral confines of said chamber housing of a substrate processing chamber. Claim 45 is therefore not rendered obvious by the combination of Srivastava and Onda and is allowable over these references.

Claim 48 is canceled. Claims 49-51 and 56-58 are amended to properly depend from independent claim 45. Dependent claims 46-47, 49-51 and 54-61 are allowable over

Srivastava and Onda for at least the reason that they depend from allowable base claim 45.

For the reasons discussed above pending claims 45-47, 49-51 and 54-61 are allowable. Accordingly, applicant requests formal allowance of such pending claims in the Examiner's next action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2008 \_\_\_\_\_

By: /Jennifer J. Taylor/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jennifer J. Taylor, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 48,711